APPENDIX I

Vol. 33, No. 47 November 22, 1974

[Editor's Note: A present controversy with regard to choice of main entry for serial publications will be the topic of an open forum at the American Library Association Midwinter Meeting in Chicago on January 19-25, 1975, sponsored by the Cataloging Code Revision Committee, Resources and Technical Services Division. C. Sumner Spalding, Assistant Director (Cataloging), and Joseph H. Howard, Chief, Serial Record Division, both of the Processing Department of the Library of Congress, have written the following articles outlining the problems and giving their personal views on the matter. Their opinions do not reflect any official views of the Library of Congress. These are intended to stimulate thought and discussion on this important problem which must be resolved in the near future. Mr. Spalding's article appeared in the July/September issue of *International Cataloguing;* Mr. Howard's article is previously unpublished.]

ISBD(S) AND TITLE MAIN ENTRY FOR SERIALS

by C. Sumner Spalding

The International Meeting of Cataloguing Experts, convened in Copenhagen in 1969 under the auspices of the IFLA Committee on Uniform Cataloguing Rules (later Committee on Cataloguing), set in motion the first major development in continuation of the success achieved by the Paris International Conference on Cataloguing Principles (1961) in the matter of the principles and general rules for entry and heading. Taking under consideration the study of "Bibliographical Data in National Bibliography Entries" prepared by Michael Gorman, the experts of the Copenhagen meeting set up a working group, with Jack Wells as chairman, charged with drafting an international standard bibliographic description for monographic publications. There was common agreement that the objective was the development of specifications for the necessary data elements, their order of presentation, and the punctuation to delimit them. These specifications should be designed to satisfy all the needs of national bibliographies, and, with whatever judicious trimming might be desirable, the needs of the libraries of the entire world. It was further agreed that these bibliographic descriptions were to be made quite independently of the heading under which they might appear in listings. The working group succeeded in its task and brought forth its provisional ISBD(M) in 1971; the first standard edition was published earlier this year. The success of this standard is manifested by the continuing increase in the number of countries that have adopted it.

At the Liverpool meeting of IFLA in 1971, a joint working group of the Committees on Cataloguing and on Serial Publications was set up to draw up an International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials, taking the ISBD(M) as a model insofar as practicable. As might be expected, the special problems presented by serial publications made the task of developing an ISBD(S) a difficult assignment which the joint working group tackled with great energy and devotion. The successive drafts were prepared by the Chairwoman and the Secretary, Mlle M.-L. Bossuat and Mlle M. Pelletier, respectively.

Probably no data element presented such a severe problem as the title. The seemingly countless "Mitteilungen," "Mémoires," "Proceedings," "Bulletins," "Trudy's," and the like seemed to demand some useful and standardized way to be particularized. A solution to this problem was found in the adoption of a device which consisted of marrying the author statement to the generic title proper with a wedding ring consisting of a space-hyphen-space and dubbing the happy couple the "distinctive title."

With the completion of international standards for the bibliographic description of both monographs and serials and with their adoption by national bibliographies and national cataloging agencies, the ultimate goal of one-time creation of bibliographic descriptions, which could then be distributed, exchanged, and utilized in any country of the world, should be achieved. True, there is still the intractable problem of the languages and writing systems used by the producing agencies in the terms of physical description and in the bibliographical notes but this is really of secondary importance. The achievement of these new standards is the ultimate that can be hoped for within the limitations of the world as it is or is likely to be in the foreseeable future.

Somewhat offsetting the caveat on the language and writing system problem mentioned above is the clarification the new standard punctuation brings to descriptions in languages that are foreign to users of

the descriptions. Just as it makes these descriptions more understandable to human beings, the punctuation can also make the various bibliographic areas and elements of the areas understandable (that is, codable) to the obedient computer if it has been provided with the needed sophisticated input programs. This, in turn, will mean a great reduction in otherwise essential human effort in the process of converting descriptions to machine-readable form. All of this is totally new. We never had it so good!

By completely separating the bibliographic description from the heading under which it might appear in a catalog, the descriptions became entirely self-sufficient as such. Heretofore, this had commonly not been the case because it was not thought always to be necessary to repeat in the description the name of the author given in the heading. This was particularly true when there was no explicit grammatical statement of authorship but only an implicit attribution at the head of the title.

This new self-sufficiency of bibliographic descriptions, particularly of serials, is now leading, ironically, to an attack on another IFLA standard, namely one of those embodied in the "Statement of Principles" for entry and heading that were adopted by the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles in 1961 at Paris. The beginnings of this turn of events, which was perhaps not entirely unforeseeable, are to be found in the establishment of the International Serials Data System (ISDS) by UNISIST, a UNESCO/International Council of Scientific Unions program. The ISDS is a registry responsible for the assignment of international standard serial numbers to serial publications. Assignment is based on the key title, normally identical with the ISBD(S) distinctive title. Any change in the key title, other than in an article or preposition, warrants a new serial number. The ISDS registry of serials also includes a basic set of bibliographic data elements. Insofar as possible, the functions of the ISDS are decentralized by delegation to a network of national centers with responsibility for the serials of their own countries. Even at the national level, there is a need for reporting by various libraries to the national center in order that the coverage may be as complete as possible. In all of this work, corporate author is at least irrelevant and is sometimes inconvenient.

In addition, there is a strong movement in North America for a cooperative effort to build an on-line machine-readable data base of live serials as a means of reducing duplication of effort, advancing automated methods of control, and building a national record of holdings. Those involved in this effort have set up a project called CONSER (Conversion of Serials), and the coordinator of the project, Richard Anable, has recommended to his Advisory Group that the criterion for setting up a new record when a serial undergoes a change be that of change in key title. Under cataloging rules, the criterion for a new record would be not only that kind of change but also a change in the name of the corporate body under which the serial is entered. The occurrence of changes in the names of corporate bodies with the concomitant conflict between these different criteria for setting up a new record, is sufficiently frequent to have led to demands for a change of cataloging rules for serials to require entry under title in all cases.

Apparently this movement is not peculiar to North America. As far back as the Grenoble meeting of IFLA in 1973, the Committee on Serials set in motion a "Study of the Function of Corporate Bodies in a Serials Catalogue" which is being coordinated by Maria Valenti. This study, in turn, is being coordinated with the Committee on Cataloguing, with the Committee of Official Publications, and with Eva Verona who is engaged in an analysis of the function of headings for corporate bodies in cataloging.

The international cataloging standard for entry and heading is in the "Statement of Principles" adopted by the ICCP in Paris in 1961. Delegates to that conference were concerned not just with the cataloging of monographic publications, not just with cataloging of serial publications, but with the cataloging of both for display in a common catalog, in most cases governed by common principles and rules. Fundamental principles that were agreed to at this conference were (1) that cataloging requires a system of multiple entries, one of which is treated as the main entry and others of which are treated as secondary; (2) that the main entry should be the author when there is a personal author; and (3) that the main entry for works that represent the expression of collective activity of a corporate body should be the corporate body. Just as there is no principle covering monographs, as such, there is no principle covering serials, as such. Serials are mentioned twice. The first time is in a footnote to the principle setting forth the conditions of main entry under corporate body. The footnote specifies conditions for entering serials under a corporate body even when the body functions more as editor than as producer of the content, the controlling criterion here being the presence of the name of the body in the title of the serial. The other occurrence is in the principle covering entry under title.

Here serials that are known primarily or conventionally by their titles are to be so entered (even if they are the products of corporate bodies).

What, then, is the impact of the demand for arbitrary entry of all serials under title on the IFLA Paris Principles? First, it proposes a rule of entry that is based on type of publication rather than on bibliographical conditions. This kind of a rule runs counter to the whole history of cataloging rule development in the last half of the 20th century. It runs counter to the fundamental principles laid out by Seymour Lubetzky as the guidelines for this historical development. Second, it introduces an element of irrationality into cataloging with the proposition that if a product of corporate activity is issued in monographic form, the body is to be considered responsible but if it is issued in serial form, it is, in effect, anonymous. The *Library of Congress List of Subject Headings*, for example, would be entered under the heading for the Library because it is a monographic work but the *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress* would be entered under title. The corporate responsibility is the same but the cataloging treatment would be different. The proposal has the effect of completely undermining the theory of corporate responsibility as justification for main entry—not just for serials but for monographs as well.

It will be useful to examine some of the reasons that have led to the proposed change in the cataloging of serials. We know that some major bibliographies and union lists of serials are organized by title, the *World List of Scientific Periodicals* and the *Catalogue collectif des périodiques* of the Bibliothèque Nationale, for example. We observe that the impetus for arbitrary entry of all serials under title comes not from catalogers of general library materials but from librarians whose responsibilities are focused on the bibliographical control of serials. The investigation of the role of corporate bodies in the catalogs of serials is the project of the IFLA Committee on Serials. The world control of serials by key title is the responsibility of the International Serials Data System. The call for change of cataloging rules in North America comes, by implication, from the Coordinator of the CONSER Project. Support for this proposal comes from serials librarians and builders of machine-readable data bases for serials.

Let us consider serials work in libraries for a moment. One striking fact is the separateness of serials work from other library activities. This results from the highly special nature of the serial publications and the special requirements for processing them to bring them under control and to make them accessible for use by readers. Whereas a monograph is processed once and for all, a serial must be processed again and again, issue after issue. The daily volume of processing operations on serials units exceeds the operations on monograph units many, many times over. A sorter, normally not a professional librarian, must consider for each issue he handles: (1) would this be entered under a corporate body? (2) if so, what would be the entry word? The recorder will record the issue in his share of the sort and for those issues for which he finds no record will have to reconsider what other reasonable possibilities of entry must be searched. Once entered in the record of serials, most of the issues will have to be matched and stored with the accumulation of previous issues of the serial until enough have been received for binding. Again, this will involve identifying the correct alphabetical word-string under which the preceding issues of the serial have been stored.

Many of those whose duty it is to supervise these operations feel that a substantial simplification would follow from recording and storing serials by their titles. With the issue in hand, what could be more straightforward than matching the title with the title in the record or the title under which the earlier issues are stored? This reasoning is persuasive, qualified only by the observation that relatively slight changes in the wording of titles can create insuperable difficulties in matching whereas the same changes would be easily manageable if entry under the responsible corporate body were in effect.

Finally, I should call attention to the involvement of considerations of automation in this matter. The ISDS is an automated system. The Nationals Serials Data Program, as the American node of ISDS, reports serials and assigns their ISSN's by key title. The CONSER Project contemplates the eventual build-up of a national machine-readable data base for live serials. This project does not underestimate the importance of retrieval approach by responsible corporate body but sees no need for main entry under such bodies. Further, CONSER proposes that only a change in key title should trigger the creation of a new record whereas a change in name of corporate main entry, even when there is no change in key title, would require a new record under present cataloging rules.

How can this conflict in the principles of cataloging for the universal catalog, monographs, serials, and all sorts of non-book materials, and the needs of those whose universe consists solely of serials be resolved?

The matter needs attention and debate by thoughtful librarians in order that the wisest course may be discerned and decided upon. The Library of Congress is urging this attention by the profession in North America. Thus, although my title is Assistant Director (Cataloging) of the Processing Department at the Library, the recommendations I shall make below are to be regarded as my personal view on this issue, not those of the Library, which, at this ~~point in~~ time, has not taken a position on the matter.

Of course, I shall side with the IFLA 1961 decision to accord main entry under corporate bodies for the publications resulting from their corporate activity, monographic or serial. I find the case for arbitrary entry under title to be essentially weak. If those who process incoming serial issues and those who store them can do their work better by using the title as the means of organizing the records and the stock of serial issues, they should do so. The present cataloging rule does not prevent this. Hence, the need for such a change is not an argument for changing the cataloging rule. It would not be amiss, however, to caution that whatever the advantages that will accrue from using title as the criterion for recording and storing, reference demands on the record and on the store may sometimes be very difficult to fill in the class of serials with generic titles such as "Bulletin," "Proceedings," and "Report" because the inquirer will not have the piece in hand but will be inquiring from a citation or else from memory and small errors or omissions may make the serial unfindable. Absolute accuracy will be a necessary condition for positive response from a single-entry record or a single-entry store of serials by their titles.

As for the situation in the machine mode, the question of main entry by title or main entry by responsible body is practically irrelevant. A positive response will occur whichever the approach. As for output, printout by title is possible whether or not main entry is by title. In some cases, however, the converse would not be true.

The only remaining difficulty is the need for making a new record under present rules when the corporate main entry heading is changed, and the title does not. Under the proposed rule the existing entry would be updated and retained. Clearly rather more work is involved under the present rule. Another record will have to be accommodated in the computer store. There is, however, no problem in relating these records in the computer. So this is all the issue seems to hang on: must we undermine a fundamental principle in our existing cataloging system because a certain class of change in serial publications could thereby be handled somewhat more simply? I think not.

MAIN ENTRY FOR SERIALS

by Joseph H. Howard

The nature of serials is such that, in both the *ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Titles Entries* and the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* (AACR), there are special rules for choice of entry for serials that differ from the rules for monographs. While the *Statement of Principles Adopted at the International Conference on Cataloging Principles* (Paris Principles) leaves much room for interpretation and controversy regarding serials, it also provides for special rules for choice of entry. It mentions serials three times. The first statement says that main entry should be under corporate body for those "serials whose titles consist of a generic term (Bulletin, Transactions, etc.) preceded or followed by the name of a corporate body, and which include some account of the activities of the body."[1] The second statement concerning serials requires main entry under title for those "works (including serials and periodicals) known primarily or conventionally by title rather than by the name of the author."[2] The third statement, also referring to title main entry, but not addressing itself specifically to *choice* of entry says, "When a serial publication is issued successively under different titles, a main entry should be made under each title for the series of issues bearing that title, with indication of at least the immediately preceding and succeeding titles. For each such series of issues, an added entry may be made under one selected title. If, however, the variations in title are only slight, the most frequently used form may be adopted as a uniform heading for all issues."[3] Various cataloging codes from around the world have interpreted this minimal guidance in different ways and some have chosen to ignore it, either totally or in part. The North American text of AACR departed from the principles because "the committee held that the inclusion in the title of a serial of the name or part of the name of the issuing corporate body is too powerful a criterion to be nullified when, in unusual cases, no account of the activities of the body is included in the publication. It also held that 'known

primarily or conventionally by title' is too vague a criterion."[4]

Cooperation and standardization on both a national and international scale are becoming increasingly more imperative in the world of rising costs and with the continued expansion of the body of knowledge, thereby making bibliographic control more expensive, difficult, and complicated. Serials are no exception.

Recent activity in the philosophical and procedural approaches to serials cataloging and processing is evident in the appearance of new acronyms and abbreviations such as ISSN (International Standard Serial Number); ISDS (International Serials Data System); and ISBD(S) (International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials).

All are directly or indirectly concerned with cataloging and, to a varying extent, all differ from our national standards and practices, and sometimes they differ with each other. In an attempt to cooperate, simplify, and standardize on an international level, many people have been involved in efforts to resolve these differences. Some of these efforts have been successful but many are still pending. The question of "entry" for serials remains a major problem.

RECORDING OF THE TITLE

Only the ISBD(S) and the Guidelines for ISDS are directly concerned with rules for cataloging. Since the ISBD(S) concern is solely with the rules for "description," it is discussed here only as it defines what is meant by "title." It is important to clarify the meaning of title because the recording of the title relates directly to the choice of entry.[5]

The ISBD(S) requires a "distinctive title" but does not define distinctive title as American librarians have defined it in the past. The ISBD(S) distinctive title is the title as it appears on the piece and, in the case of a generic term, the term plus the name of the issuing body (also as it appears on the piece) preceded by a space-hyphen-space. Another way of looking at it is that there will no longer be generic titles; rather there will be only generic terms followed by an issuing body–thereby making the title distinctive: for example, "Journal - American Medical Association."

The IFLA Working Group that developed the ISBD(S) sought to achieve compatibility with the Guidelines for ISDS. Thus, in most cases, the distinctive title of ISBD(S) is the same as the key title of ISDS. For those serials which have identical or common titles, however, ISDS adds qualifying elements to the key title whereas ISBD(S) generally includes the qualifying elements in the imprint area. While there are other conflicts between the Guidelines for ISDS and ISBD(S), the appropriate committees are committed to their resolution.

Changes have been made in AACR to make the rules compatible with the ISBD(S). With the dropping of rule 162B (as announced in *Cataloging Service*, Bulletin 108, April 1974), the title is no longer truncated as it was in the past. For example, AACR 162B allowed the cataloger to truncate *Journal of the American Medical Association* to *Journal* because the entry was the American Medical Association. With the disappearance of 162B, the title is recorded in full while the entry remains the same. Another major hurdle has been resolved between ISBD(S) and AACR (announced in *Cataloging Service*, Bulletin 109, May 1974) since AACR now requires that the author statement be added to titles which consist solely of generic terms. The two elements are separated by a space-hypen-space.

With these two changes, the ISBD(S) and AACR are in basic agreement on how to record the title. The ISBD(S) has nothing to do with rules for choice of entry; however, the Guidelines for ISDS are concerned with entry and require the key title approach as the main entry for serial publications, thereby coming immediately into conflict with the U.S. standard, AACR.

CHOICE OF ENTRY

The difference in entry between AACR and the Guidelines for ISDS is a major problem when it becomes involved with changes in serials because ISSN's are assigned on the basis of title (rather than bibliographic entity) and a new ISSN is assigned only to a new title, not to a new entry which, under AACR, may be made for either change in issuing body and/or title.

For example, a serial entitled *Estimates of Employees by Province and Industry* was entered, following AACR, under "Canada. Bureau of Statistics." The Guidelines for ISDS require that the entry be under the title and that the ISSN be assigned to the title. When the corporate body changed its name, a new AACR entry was required under "Canada. Statistics Canada. Monthly Employment, Payrolls, and Labour Income Section." Since the title did not change, there would be no new entry nor ISSN under the Guidelines for ISDS–only an addition to the existing record to reflect the changed name of the corporate body.

There are at least two alternatives that would solve this problem. One would be to make the ISBD(S)

distinctive title the entry element for all serials and make added entries for any necessary issuing bodies. The other alternative would be to enter serials that consist of generic terms plus the issuing body under corporate body and enter all other serials under title with an added entry for any necessary issuing body. Drafts of a revision of AACR rule 6 reflecting these alternatives follow.

ALTERNATIVE 1

(6) Serials.

Preliminary note. This rule for serials (including numbered monographic series) applies also to entries for unnumbered monographic series and to series added entries (cf. 33N) made for monographs in a series (whether numbered or not).

(A) Enter a serial under its title.

If an added entry is required for a serial, and if the title of the serial is identical with that of another serial, add in parentheses the city of publication. If this addition is insufficient, add also the years of publication.

For serials issued by or under the authority of a corporate body, make an added entry for the corporate body.

For serials by a personal author, make an added entry for the personal author.

(B) If the title of a serial changes, make a separate entry for the issues appearing after the change. If, however, the change is of a very minor character, it is simply noted on the existing entry (see 167K).

If the corporate body accorded an added entry for a serial changes or undergoes a change of name, make an added entry also under the new body or the new name of the body.

If the personal author accorded an added entry for a serial change make an added entry also under the new personal author.

ALTERNATIVE 2

(6) Serials.

Preliminary note. This rule for serials (including numbered monographic series) applies also to entries for unnumbered monographic series and to series added entries (cf. 33N) made for monographs in a series (whether numbered or not).

(A) Enter a serial under its title.

If an added entry is required for a serial, and if the title of the serial is identical with that of another serial, add in parentheses the city of publication. If this addition is insufficient, add also the years of publication.

For serials issued by or under the authority of a corporate body, make an added entry for the corporate body. For serials by a personal author, make an added entry for the personal author.

Exception:

(1) If the title of a serial as it appears on the piece consists solely of a generic term, enter under issuing body if there is one.

(2) If the title of a serial as it appears on the piece begins with a generic term followed only by the name of the issuing body [6] (initialisms and acronyms are not to be considered names of bodies), enter under issuing body named in the title.

(B) If the title of a serial changes, make a separate entry for the issues appearing after the change following the specifications for entry as given in 6A. If, however, the change is of a very minor character, it is simply noted on the existing entry (see 167K).

If the corporate body accorded an added entry for a serial changes or undergoes a change of name, make an added entry also under the new body or the new name of the body.

If the personal author accorded an added entry for a serial changes, make an added entry also under the new personal author.

Under both alternatives, as well as the existing rule, a solid definition of "generic term" is needed so that catalogers can come closer to agreement on both choice of entry and in recording of the title. Generic term is not defined either in AACR or the ALA *Glossary of Library Terms*, and catalogers have many problems. Are single subject word titles such as "History," "Science," "Economics" generic? Are "Science Newsletter," "Research and Development Report," or "Bibliographical Series" generic? Are they perhaps common titles instead? Opinions differ widely.

For the purpose of discussion, the following guidelines, based on unpublished ISDS guidelines which have been adopted by all ISDS centers, are given:

(1) ISDS definition of generic term: "one which indicates the kind and/or periodicity of a publication."

Examples: Annual conference proceedings, Annual report, Annual reports, Budget in brief, Bulletin, Circular, Journal, Membership directory, Occasional newsletter, Official report, Pamphlet, Preliminary report, Proceedings of the conference, Program, Record, Research paper, Review, Special report, Transactions

(2) Titles which contain (or consist of) terms

indicating subject content or coverage are not to be considered generic.

Examples: Anthropological reports, Seismological bulletin, Astronomy, Behavioral science series, Chemical bulletin, Clinical science, Science bulletin, Medical series bulletin

(3) Titles which include words other than those indicating periodicity or kind of publication are generally not to be considered generic.

Examples: Average monthly weather outlook, External trade statistics, Employment statistics, Nationalities papers, Staff papers series, Services and organization guide, Summary of general legislation, Technical services program, Training and methods series, Tutorial lecture series, State salary survey

(4) Titles which contain (or consist of) acronyms or initialisms are not to be considered generic.

Examples: B.E.A. staff paper, B.I.S. report, Research report ADM, Bulletin GT

(5) In general, titles consisting of more than five words (exclusive of "empty words") are not to be considered generic.

Examples: Directory of faculty, professional and administrative staff, and students; Appropriation statements by departments and agencies. All funds; Annual descriptive report of program activities for vocational education; Annual report. National resources and recreation agencies

(6) When there is doubt that a term is generic, it will be considered that it is.

Solving the problem of entry is, however, not only a problem on the international scale, but also a major problem on the national and local levels.

In any cooperative effort, whether it be international, such as ISDS and CONSER (CONversion of SERials), or national, or local, it seems to me to be imperative that the rules for choice of entry be such that they can be interpreted in the same way by everyone. Time could be better spent in new cataloging rather than in the now prevalent necessity of recataloging to resolve differences of opinion concerning choice of entry. This is necessary because the existing rules are such that, in a sizable number of cases, differing choices for entry can be made by different catalogers for the same title depending on differences in interpretation, a misunderstanding of the rules, or what issues are in hand at the time of cataloging. Let me illustrate.

If a cataloger is working on *External Trade of Liberia: Exports,* issued by the Department of Planning and Economic Affairs of Liberia, he has several decisions to make. If he does not know the frequency of the publication he may decide that it cannot be a yearbook and does not seem to fit the definition of periodical as given in the glossary of AACR. He makes his entry under issuing body. A second cataloger could decide that the publication is, indeed, a periodical; so his entry is under title. A third cataloger, working perhaps from different or additional issues of the same publication, finds information that the frequency is annual. He decides that he has a yearbook in the terms of the definition in the *ALA Glossary of Library Terms* and his entry, too, is under title. A fourth cataloger, knowing the publication is annual, may feel that he cannot consider the publication a yearbook because as footnote 8 to AACR 6 says that "the term 'yearbook' is to be understood to exclude a work the content of which is necessarily the expression of the corporate thought or activity of the body," and so he uses the issuing body as his main entry.

None of these catalogers is clearly wrong, but they wind up with two different choices of entries and four rationalizations for the choices. It seems obvious that choice of entry should not depend on data elements which may not be apparent from the piece in hand such as frequency; nor should choice of entry depend on the cataloger's being able to identify a serial as a member of classes of publications which are impossible to define precisely, such as periodical or yearbook.

Another example concerns catalog versus bibliography. It had never occured to the serials catalogers at the Library of Congress that a distinction needed to be made between the two until it was brought to their attention that the *ALA Glossary of Library Terms* limits the use of bibliography to "a list of books, maps, etc., differing from a catalog in not being necessarily a list of materials in a collection, a library, or a group of libraries." Under this definition *New Serial Titles* and the *National Union Catalog* should be entered under author as required under AACR 6B2 as "any other serial." Is this distinction necessary? How many libraries have made the same mistake as the Library of Congress?

Legal serials, conferences publications cataloged as serials, and other special types of serial publications, present another problem in compatibility between libraries. Nowhere in AACR is it stated that any rule for entry other than AACR 6 is to be used for serials. Therefore, libraries following AACR 6 may be at variance with the Library of Congress practice of using AACR 20-26 for many legal serials, or other

rules for other special types of serials.

It may be argued that a corporate body main entry for some serials is necessary so that serial entries will "conform" to entries for monographs. AACR 6, however, does not allow serials to be entered in a way that will match the entries for monographs as detailed in the other rules. For example, bibliographies and indexes which are monographs are usually entered under the compiler; as serials, they are usually entered under title. We have been able to live with this inconsistency and other similar ones, and therefore it should not be any harder to abandon the principle of entry under authorship for serials entirely and enter all of them under title than to live with the inconsistencies perpetuated by the present rules.

A thorough discussion of the title main entry concept can be found in M. Nabil Hamdy's *The Concept of Main Entry as Represented in the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules; A Critical Appraisal with Some Suggestions: Author Main Entry vs. Title Main Entry.*

The foregoing examples illustrate only some of the situations in which it is impossible to achieve compatibility in choice of entry from cataloger to cataloger. They also serve to show that the existing rules are impracticable and impossible to apply uniformly, thereby requiring expensive editorial work by a single authority in any cooperative effort in order to reconcile the differences between varying choices of entry.

Why should catalogers be required to split hairs in regard to interpretations of rules and definitions? How can an accessioner who is working with a check-in file based on AACR be expected to deal with these meaningless variations in either recording an issue of a serial or setting up a preliminary check-in entry which will in many cases be overturned by the cataloger who is also using AACR? Do patrons understand the rules? Do reference librarians? Do all catalogers even understand? I submit that they do not. It is my personal opinion that the rules, which are intended to recognize the importance of authorship by affording it the main entry, are in practice and in a sizable number of instances, not achieving this end. What is wrong with recognizing the importance of authorship by rewarding it with an added entry? The patron is served.

---

[1] *Statement of Principles Adopted at the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, Paris, October 1961,* Annotated ed. (London, IFLA Committee on Cataloging, 1971), p. 41.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 101.

[3] *Ibid.,* pp. 115-116.

[4] *AACR,* p. 3.

[5] The ISBD(S) will be used as the basis for the revision of Chapter 7 of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules.*

[6] Exclusive of words indicating grammatical linkage–for example, "of the," "de la," and "des."

APPENDIX II

37TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR INFORMATION SCIENCE
Atlanta, Ga., October 13-17, 1974

More than 1,300 registrants participated in the Annual Meeting of the American Society for Information Science held at the Hyatt Regency Atlanta Hotel in Atlanta, Ga., on October 13-17. The meeting focused on the examination of the theme, "Information Utilities," and the program was organized around four plenary sessions, six info-user workshops, and numerous technical sessions, special interest group meetings, doctoral forums, and tours of local information and computer centers as well as industry exhibits and an information theater.

The opening of the conference was presided over by Vladimir Slamecka of the Georgia Institute of Technology, ASIS-74 Conference Chairman. After a

few preliminary remarks, he introduced ASIS President Herbert S. White, who reviewed the developments of the past year and the present position of the Society. Among items of interest and note were the improved financial condition, the continued growth in membership, the chartering of new chapters and special interest groups, the inauguration of a new publication, the *bulletin*, the success of the Johnstown meeting in May, resulting in Council approval of a mid-year meeting as a regularly scheduled event, and the growing exhibitor interest that drew twice as many organizations to Atlanta as to any previous ASIS convention. He proceeded to comment on the issues facing the Society, especially the question of whether it should "go international" or retain its American character.

Chairman Slamecka then introduced Georgia Governor Jimmy Carter whose education and early career were in nuclear physics and engineering and who demonstrated his understanding of information science and related fields by describing in some detail the extensive reorganization of the Georgia State government's executive branch that he had effected utilizing the latest computer-based management analysis and information manipulating techniques. Gov. Carter then assessed the need for such an approach in the other 49 States, in local governments, and at the national level. With regard to the Federal government, he attacked the lack of overall national goals, criticized the failure to make use of the knowledge and analytical capabilities available to Congress and the Executive Branch to identify and define national policies and to solve pressing problems, and called upon information scientists and all scientists to press for a strong voice in shaping the future. Joshua I. Smith, Executive Director of ASIS, closed the inaugural proceedings with an encapsulated description of the program planned for the registrants.

FIRST PLENARY SESSION

The subject of the session was information services to the general public, and Chairman Manfred Kochen, Mental Health Research Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, posed the thesis that technological advances, such as two-way television and international networks, make possible the expression and feedback of instant outrage, semi-individualized continuing education, and counseling, improving information, and referral.

Elaborating on these observations, the panelists discussed the demands for new kinds of services, the issues, and the problems that arise not only in planning the new services but also those in anticipation of how they may be delivered. Marilyn M. Levine, Milwaukee Urban Observatory, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, described a study of the feasibility of devising an information system that would meet the needs of a large metropolitan area's government and social service agencies and the community groups which interact with them. Information requirements centered on "how to do it" and "how others are doing it." Sources most used were government publications, newspapers, published reports, newsletters, journals, directories, books, internal memoranda, and general magazines. The nature of the information preferred was primarly statistical, the most favored being an on-line system accessing bibliographic information and abstracts, having a browsing capability, and capable of producing complete texts of selected material.

Edwin B. Parker, Stanford University, addressed the role of information in society. After describing the evolution of American society from its essentially agricultural beginnings through its industrial phase to one based on information, the speaker observed that when information dominates cooperation works better than competition. The concept of patents, licensing, and copyright tends to make information into a commodity and results in competition and the development of stress. Information is not used up; exchange actually increases the amount. When one person gives another information, the donor still has his original supply undiminished, so the marginal cost of production is zero. Notwithstanding inflation, the cost of information is declining with the improvement of techniques. Perhaps it would be possible to shift the demand for commodities in short supply, like oil, to information; to substitute advanced education for a second car? Perhaps the countries with highly developed information systems can export information to the rest of the world.

The next panelist, Ithiel de Sola Pool, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, picked up the international theme in "The Global Nature of Information Services." Admitting that predictions in the information technology field have not always been good, he noted that electronics could obviate the necessity for underdeveloped countries' investing in publishing, libraries, and other printing-based information systems and that investing in remote terminals and equipment to utilize satellite-communications that could tie into existing systems in developed countries would instead be more effective. Further, he speculated that no need will exist for mass access to mass

produced information; instead, the future may see more specialized data for an audience of specialists, similar to the replacement of general magazines by specialized journals, multi-channel CATV rather than few channels, information services for consumers rather than for producers, and less geographical limitation. From the floor, John Carroll, University of Western Ontario, interposed two points countering Parker's view: transnational transmissions, like multinational corporations, (1) may threaten to undercut governments and become uncontrollable, and (2) may exacerbate differences because data-rich countries will continue to have the advantages and continue to become richer.

The final panelist, Beatrice Fitzpatrick, Administrative and Management Research Association of New York, described the library-based Citizens' Urban Information Centers program that has been developed for the Brooklyn Public Library's 55 neighborhood branches. The objective of this program is to provide, early in 1975, a one-stop neighborhood center for free, public information about all city, State, and Federal government programs that provide services or benefits to Brooklyn residents. Information will also be available about health, education, and social services offered by voluntary agencies. Principal funding is by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ASIA-INFORMATION INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION INFO-USER WORKSHOP

The future of publishing was the subject of discussions which asserted that books and journals will be replaced by on-line terminals; that the development of SDI has not been unreservedly successful because it is too specialist-oriented; that while libraries have been out of the picture until recently, they are getting more use as middlemen and backup; and that the entire situation is too chaotic to assess, but that print media will be around a long time.

Two sessions on current library networks provided descriptions of the current status and uses of MEDLINE and TOXLINE of the National Library of Medicine, by Grace McCarn of NLM; of the Federal library experiment with a bibliographic network that now includes about 20 Government libraries and the Ohio College Library Çenter, by Madeline Henderson of the National Bureau of Standards; of NELINET (the New England Library Network), by Ronald F. Miller of the New England Board of Higher Education; and of the National Agricultural Library's CAIN system and its users, by Nancy L. Ayer. These presentations were followed by a discussion of the future of networks by Frederick Kilgour, Ohio College Library Center, in which were predicted the discontinuance of card and book catalogs, a reduction in cataloging detail required, increased current information readily available to users such as being able to determine by a telephone call whether an item is on shelf and can be borrowed, elimination of the requirement to keep materials not needed frequently but available from other sources, and the possibility that publishers may replace libraries by utilizing systems now available to custom print, assemble, and supply in binders only those portions of books that the customer needs. The network sessions were concluded by a discussion of the economics of information systems presented by Davis McCarn, National Library of Medicine.

SECOND PLENARY SESSION

The Tuesday morning session on the evolution of information utilities was chaired by Tefko Saracevic, Case Western Reserve University, and attempted to identify any common characteristics that information systems share with public utilities. Although the concept of "information utility" has been around for several years, is referred to in reports of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and appears in numerous books, papers, and descriptions of grants for research, its definition, practicality, and applicability are uncertain. Chairman Saracevic outlined questions about the notion, Donald J. Hillman, Lehigh University, compared networking to public utilities, H. J. A. Goodman, University of Calgary, discussed the emerging world information system, and M. M. Kessler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, discussed the user as customer. In the end, however, neither the panelists nor the audience seemed any nearer answering the question whether information utilities are potentially public utilities.

SPECIAL SESSION

Lee G. Burchinal, Head, Office of Science Information Service, National Science Foundation, described the fiscal 1975 goals and objectives of his office in furthering its franchise of developing new or improved methods for making scientific information available. In focusing its resources on three broad areas, namely, (1) research to provide data for guiding improved management of scientific and technical information across the broad range of activities in our pluralistic STI enterprise, (2) experiments to facilitate emergence of service networks capable of providing

cost assured access to information, and (3) activities designed to encourage development of working conditions within research and development settings that promote use of information, OSIS has identified 17 specific goals which will be used to derive program objectives toward which project-supported activities can be directed (details are given in the August-September ASIS *bulletin*, p. 5). Mary Good, University of New Mexico, Ben Weil, Exxon Research and Engineering Co., and Michael Harris, John Wiley and Sons, commented on the program from the viewpoints of the scientific community, the information scientists, and the book publisher.

THIRD PLENARY SESSION

The Wednesday morning session, under the chairmanship of Joseph Becker, Becker and Hayes, Inc., dealt with information utilities and public policy. Beginning with a definition of "information utilities" as "a dynamic machine-readable data base available on-line to multiple individual users through a shared communication system," the chairman asserted that their wide-spread introduction into our society seems certain. How best to control their evolution for public benefit is an important issue. Already, he noted, there are an estimated 200,000 computers in use today; and, although only one percent of the population has come into direct contact with them, the number may increase to 100 percent by 1985. The public has a vital interest, therefore, in the rapid and fundamental changes occurring in how information systems perform; what regulations and restraints on the invasion of privacy are required, for instance, are of paramount importance.

The first speaker, W. Lee Burge, President and Chief Executive Officer, Retail Credit Co., led off with a discussion of the delicate balance between the right to know and the protection of privacy. After detailing the development of his company from an agency which investigated and reported on the reliability of prospective policyholders for insurors into a general credit information gatherer, he described the necessity for such an activity and the measures taken to assure that the information developed is made available only to those needing to know for indicated legitimate reasons. Anthony G. Oettinger, Director, Program on Information Technologies and Public Policy, Harvard University, and author of *Run, Computer, Run,* discussed the social and technical issues revolving around the question of privacy. Competition in the common carrier industry, the governmental regulations imposed, and the often conflicting aspects of maintaining privacy were reviewed by Brig. Gen. Harold R. Johnson, Vice President for Marketing and Services Development of Western Union. The last speaker, Walter Hinchman, Chief, Consumer Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, sketched the current status and future trends of his agency's efforts to balance the needs of the industry and the interest of the public. All seemed to agree that technical developments are occurring with such speed that public policymakers have difficulty keeping up and that sessions such as this raise more questions than they answer.

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS WORKSHOP

This interesting, wide-ranging info-user workshop was chaired by James B. Adler, President, Congressional Information Service, who inaugurated the discussion by noting that, notwithstanding the energy and great resources that have been applied by public and private agencies to make government documents widely accessible and useful, there is still much room for improvement and further development. Wellington Lewis, Superintendent of Documents, described the services and functions of the U.S. Government Printing Office. Noting that GPO is alleged to be the largest printing plant in the world, he pointed out that it is essentially a simple black and white printer whose principal client is Congress. Consequently, much printing, especially that requiring the use of complex and advanced techniques, is contracted out. Other aspects mentioned were GPO's function as coordinator of all Government printing since many Government agencies have their own printing and publishing establishments; its retail sales activities, including the growing chain of GPO stores being opened outside Washington; and developments in microphotographic publishing.

Dean Smith summarized the activities of the National Technical Information Service with particular emphasis on its marketing of Government documents. He pointed out that the service operates on a revolving fund and, therefore, must recoup its costs; its only appropriated funds are for experimental purposes. The service does extensive advertising, pushes sales to bookstores, and has recently contracted for the use of American Express billing in order to increase sales. It is not for profit, but most of the products it handles are not potentially commercially profitable. Whenever it has a profitable publication, however, it does encourage a for-profit distributor to take over. The service's charges, for these various rea-

sons, are not, therefore, appreciably less than those of commercial houses.

Shirli Christensen of IFI/Plenum Information Corporation discussed the commercial document acquisition and research services, whose growth has been accelerated by the Freedom of Information Act, and the resulting increase in information available. Among the factors that have contributed to this development are: (1) difficulty of physical access; members of the public who need the information cannot get to Washington, D.C., or the regional office; (2) the law does not require the agency to handle the documents, just make them available; and (3) the customer must have guidance to the source of needed information as well as assistance in getting it. Consequently, many for-profit service organizations, both specialized and general, have sprung up.

Picking up the theme of the difficulties in accessing Government publications, Mr. Adler recited additional problems including the lack of publicity for Government publications, few reviews, a fragmented market, limited incentives for keeping books in print, and the requirement to make 1,000 copies available to depository libraries as a counter-incentive to publishing. On the brighter side, however, he commented that although commercial book promotions are not appropriate, the system developed for scientific and technical information will offer access through abstracting and indexing and microreproduction to facilitate storage and retrieval. He cited some examples: the cumulative subject index to the *Monthly Catalog* in 15 volumes packaged with the catalogs themselves in microform (U.S. Historical Documents, Inc.) as well as similar packages made available by his own Congressional Information Service. Adler concluded by noting that the tools for using Government publications as developed within information systems are not generally taught in library schools and that the sales force for these organizations has to help librarians educate the user. The high cost of the system, however, is in fact compensated for by offering a control over the materials that does not otherwise exist, provides access on-line, and, through micropublishing with its easily stored, retrievable, cataloged, and indexed corpus, provides instant libraries.

Final speaker at the workshop, Bernard Fry, Dean of the Graduate Library School, Indiana University, reviewed the past neglect and increasing interest in Government documents, as described by the preceding panel members. He mentioned that although Government documents are coming out of the attics of libraries, they are usually made available in special document sections and are not included in the main stream of literature. Information about them is developing and efforts are being made to increase familiarity, improve ease of access, and effect better control. In this connection he mentioned *Government Publications Review,* a quarterly journal he edits, and the Government Documents Roundtable (GODORT) of the American Library Association. Repeating the significance of the expanding means of access, he discussed the need to coordinate the many approaches and to place greater emphasis on education about the tools. A real requirement exists for a user study and an analysis of the problems in using Government documents. He deplored the low priority given cataloging of such materials and said this accounts for the confusing diversity in systems of control; libraries use Sudoc, LC, Dewey, and others. There is need for basic catalog cards with standardized format for a central source; consideration should be given to cataloging in publication. Mr. Fry then noted that most of what had been said pertained to U.S. Federal Government documents and almost no consideration has been given to State and local publications, knowledge of which is almost completely undeveloped. He called attention to the importance of the Library of Congress *Monthly Checklist of State Publications,* but added that it has not added much to the control of them. Luckily, most States do produce checklists of their own publications. The speaker also observed in passing that the Center for Research Libraries has the largest collection of State documents.

In conclusion, Mr. Fry decried the tendency to lump limited interest documents together with those of general interest, noting that while this is more characteristic of State documents than Federal, it applies to all to a great extent and underscores the need to be selective or establish priorities. Documents that are information sources must be differentiated from those that are an archival record.

BUSINESS MEETING

During the annual business meeting, chaired by outgoing president Herbert S. White, the reports of various officers and committees were presented and accepted. Dale B. Baker, Chemical Abstracts Service, the 1975-75 ASIS President, then announced the result of the election of officers: Melvin S. Day, National Library of Medicine, President-elect for 1976; Frank Kurt Cylke, Library of Congress, Secretary; and David Batty and Audrey Grosch, councilors-

at-large. Frank Slater was elected Assembly Councilor, and Ruth L. Tighe, ASIS-75 Chairman, will serve as member of Council for the year.

AWARDS BANQUET

At the banquet held on October 16, the following presentations were made: Outstanding Information Sciences Movie award to Bell Telephone for "Hello, I Need to Tell You Something"; Best Chapter or SIG publication award to the Pacific Northwest Chapter newsletter entitled "Points Northwest," edited by Darlene Myers; Best ASIS Student Member Paper award to Linda C. Smith, Georgia Institute of Technology, for "Systematic Searching of Abstracts and Indexing in Interdisciplinary Areas"; Best JASIS Paper award to Victor Rosenberg for "The Scientific Premises of Information Sciences," that appeared in the July-August 1974 JASIS; and the annual Award of Merit to Manfred Kochen "for his efforts to promote an understanding of the inter-relationship between information, on the one hand, and/or behavioral processes, on the other."

FINAL PLENARY SESSION

The final session on information utilities from a longe-range point of view, convened on Thursday, October 17, with Davis B. McCarn, National Library of Medicine, as chairman. Beginning with the premise that information utilities will have an immense effect on the future of libraries but that their impact is only one aspect of the technological trends in librarianship, the speakers examined these trends at the national and international level, the nature of the future technological revolution in information transfer, and the role of information science research in that future. John C. Gray, Office of Scientific and Technical Information, Department of Education and Science, British Library, London, surveyed national developments in four Western European countries and intergovernmental approaches in the European Space Research Organization and the European Economic Community. Comparison with the American situation is inevitable, but the problems are such as to require significantly different solutions. Noteworthy variations are the relatively small size of national markets and the many languages involved, the first providing an incentive for international cooperation and the second forming a barrier to it. Lucio Chiaraviglio, Georgia Institute of Technology, briefly reviewed the literature dealing with the socio-economic implications of advances in knowledge and technology in order to emphasize the necessity of directing research in the information disciplines principally to the solution of problems of effective utilization of problem solving knowledge. Chairman McCarn closed the session by concluding that, whatever specific solutions are adopted to the problems of information utility, we are in for a period of turmoil and change. Computer and communications technology have begun to make an impact on information transfer. Television once seemed about to bankrupt the motion picture and radio industries; it did not. But TV did alter their roles and audiences. Computers and communications are likely to have the same kind of revolutionary impact on libraries.

[*S. Branson Marley, Jr.*]

ASIS LIAISON GROUP

The ASIS liaison representatives and members of the ASIS Inter-Society Cooperation Committee met on October 16 to discuss a study of the research and development planning requirements and priorities of the scientific and technical information community. The study, supported by the National Science Foundation, will be directed by Joshua I. Smith, Executive Director of ASIS.

The ASIS effort is designed to identify and communicate the research and development planning requirements, goals, objectives, and funding priorities of public and private organizations making up the scientific and technical information community in the United States. The work will include a survey and identification of short and long range requirements among a large segment of information producers and users, including independent analysis of needs, directions, and requirements for research and development leading to improved services. The survey will involve public discussion of both the technological aspects of information and the impact of information systems on society. An important task will be the development of a feedback mechanism to provide the means for obtaining timely and relevant comments from the proposed planning conferences and follow-up workshop sessions.

ASIS will provide the expertise to identify the critical issues and problem areas for investigation and discussion, and will analyze the data gathered from a survey questionnaire and the feedback received from the conferences and workshops. Final results will provide a basis for updating planning information and developing a comprehensive National Program Document describing requirements and priorities.

Lee G. Burchinal, OSIS, and Mr. Smith responded to questions from the floor. Mr. Burchinal noted that

his office is (1) seeking comments and review from the science and engineering communities and from scientific and technical information experts and organizations (Through a series of working conferences run by ASIS, the OSIS expects to receive constructive criticism of its program and recommendations for new initiatives.); (2) conducting, in collaboration with the foundation's Office of Planning and Resources Management, an assessment of the foundation's science information program from 1950 through fiscal year 1973 (The results of this effort will be used to review OSIS goals and objectives and the strategies and methods for attaining them.); and (3) actively soliciting views of NSF management and other Federal agencies on needs for improvement in science communication.

The meeting concluded with an understanding that comments from ASIS liaison representatives on the following questions would be welcome: Do you agree with the overall approach? Are there substantial additions, changes, or deletions you feel should be made? What do you feel will be the impact of this program on your liaison association?

[*Frank Kurt Cylke*]

SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP ON AUTOMATED LANGUAGE PROCESSING

William R. Nugent, Assistant Coordinator of Information Systems, Library of Congress and SIG/ALP Chairman, moderated a technical session on Progress in Speech Understanding Systems. The session constituted an interim report on a five-year program sponsored by the Advanced Research Projects Agency, U.S. Department of Defense, on computation directed by human speakers. Successes in earlier ARPA-sponsored work in computational linguistics directed towards machine "understanding" of directives and queries in natural English expressed in machine-readable text prompted an extension into machine understanding of speech. Speech is the most natural way for a human to express his wishes to other humans or machines, especially when the machine can both accept speech directives (via signal analysis) and deliver speech responses (via speech synthesis).

Frank Cooper, Haskins Laboratory, New Haven, Conn., provided an overview of ARPA objectives in the program and described the work of his laboratory. Mr. Cooper was one of the select panel of experts in acoustics and recording technology called upon to analyze the 18-minute gap in the Watergate Tapes, but he declined to discuss this activity, and spoke instead of his laboratory's efforts in prosodics research which are leading towards a bidirectional capability in both analysis and synthesis of spoken English. A paper entitled "On Finding One's Way From Phonetic Text and Back" was delivered jointly by Mr. Cooper and Paul Mermelstein, also of Haskins Laboratory.

Lee Erman, Carnegie Mellon University, delivered a paper prepared by himself and Raj Reddy on "The HEARSAY Speech Understanding System." In this system, patterns of connected speech are analyzed in a specific and limited context of discourse, such as new retrieval and chess playing. The computer response to a verbal command begins with "I think you said . . . ." followed by the computer's interpretation of the command, and if verification is given, the indicated action (retrieval or chess move) is carried out. Typically all possible contextual clues are used in the machine analysis and decision progress, including an estimate of the speaker's most likely chess moves depending on the present configuration of pieces. A motion picture was shown documenting the progress of the HEARSAY project and provided persuasive demonstrations of the future role of speech in interactive man-machine communications.

[*William R. Nugent*]

SPECIAL RESEARCH GROUP ON CLASSIFICATION RESEARCH

On October 14 the Classification Research Group conducted a panel discussion between four of its members. Speaking were Edward Blume, Chief of the Library of Congress Subject Cataloging Division, on "The Information Classifier as Seen in the Maintenance of the Library of Congress Classification Schedules"; Jessica Harris, St. Johns University (Brooklyn), on "The Use of Classification Systems as seen in the Membership of the SIG/Classification Research"; and Lester Neidell, Georgia Institute of Technology, on "The Data Classifier as seen in the Membership and Activities of the Classification Society."

[*Edward J. Blume*]